

Lars C. Golumbic, *pro hac vice*  
Sarah M. Adams *pro hac vice*  
Rosemary A. Loehr, *pro hac vice*  
**GROOM LAW GROUP, CHARTERED**  
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
P: (202) 857-0620  
F: (202) 659-4503  
lgolumbic@groom.com  
sadams@groom.com  
rloehr@groom.com

Dylan D. Rudolph, Bar No. 278707  
drudolph@truckerhuss.com  
**TRUCKER HUSS, APC**  
135 Main Street, 9th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
P: (415) 788-3111  
F: (415) 421-2017

*Attorneys for Defendants*

Lindsey Barnhart, Bar No. 294995  
**COVINGTON & BURLING LLP**  
3000 El Camino Real  
5 Palo Alto Square, 10th Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112  
P: (650) 632-4700  
F: (650) 632-4800  
lbarnhart@cov.com

Robert Newman, *pro hac vice*  
**COVINGTON & BURLING LLP**  
850 10th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
P: (202) 662-5125  
F: (202) 778-5125  
rnewman@cov.com

William O'Neil, *pro hac vice*  
**COVINGTON & BURLING LLP**  
620 Eighth Avenue  
New York, NY 10018  
P: (212) 841-1103  
F: (646) 441-9103  
woneil@cov.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

DEBORAH RODRIGUEZ,  
individually and as a representative of a class of  
participants and beneficiaries on behalf of the  
intuit Inc. 401 (k) Plan,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTUIT INC.; THE EMPLOYEE BENEFITS  
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
INTUIT INC. 401(K) PLAN; and DOES 1 to 10  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:23-cv-05053-PCP

**NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL  
AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

**TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND ALL PARTIES OF RECORD:**

Defendants Intuit Inc. and the Employee Benefits Administrative Committee of the Intuit Inc. 401(k) Plan (collectively, “Defendants”) hereby provide notice that, on June 17, 2024, the Honorable Beth Labson Freeman of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California issued an order (the “Order”) granting defendants’ motion to dismiss plaintiff’s complaint in *Hutchens v. HP Inc.*, No. 5:23-cv-05875-BLF (N.D. Cal.). A copy of the Court’s Order is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

In its Order, the Court found that plaintiff’s allegations challenging defendants’ use of forfeitures to reduce defendant HP Inc.’s contributions to its 401(k) plan, instead of using forfeitures to pay the plan’s administrative expenses, failed to state plausible claims for breaches of defendants’ fiduciary duties, failure to monitor fiduciaries, or violations of ERISA’s anti-inurement and prohibited transactions provisions. The Court granted defendants’ motion with leave to amend.

Dated: June 18, 2024

**GROOM LAW GROUP, CHTD.**

/s/ Sarah M. Adams

Sarah M. Adams (*pro hac vice*)

*Attorney for Defendant Intuit Inc.*